arXiv:1401.4002v1 [math.LO] 16 Jan 2014

Circular Proofs for Gödel-Löb Logic

Daniyar Shamkanov*
Steklov Mathematical Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences
National Research University Higher School of Economics
daniyar.shamkanov@gmail.com

January 17, 2014

Abstract

We present a sequent-style proof system for provability logic GL that admits so-called circular proofs. For these proofs, the graph underlying a proof is not a finite tree but is allowed to contain cycles. As an application, we establish Lindon interpolation for GL syntactically.

Keywords: circular proofs, provability logic, sequent calculus.

1 Introduction

Gödel-Löb logic GL is a modal logic, which describes all universally valid principals of the formal provability in Peano arithmetic. This logic has attracted strong interest and a lot of effort has been directed to the search of an adequate, cut-free sequent calculus for GL (see [6, 7, 4]). In the present paper we propose a sequent-style proof system for GL that admits so-called circular proofs. A circular proof can be formed from an ordinary derivation by identifying each non-axiomatic leaf of the derivation tree with an identical interior node via so-called "back-links" (see Section 3). These kind of proofs appears to be an interesting alternative to traditional proofs for logics that contain fixed-point operators (cf. [3]). Since GL can be seen as a fragment of the modal μ-calculus (see [13, 14, 1]), there should be applications of circular proofs to GL. We present one such application in the present paper.

*Supported by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research, and Russian Presidential Council for Support of Leading Scientific Schools.

Though Gödel-Löb logic possesses Lyndon interpolation [10], there were seemingly no syntactic proofs for this result. It is unclear how Lyndon interpolation can be obtained from previously introduced sequent systems [6, 7, 4] by direct proof-theoretic arguments because these systems contain inference rules where the principal formula changes polarity from the conclusion to the premise. In this note, we obtain Lyndon interpolation for GL by applying circular proofs.

In the next section, we recall a variant of the standard sequent calculus for GL. Then we introduce the circular proof system and prove its equivalence to the standard one. In the final section, we establish Lyndon interpolation for GL syntactically.

2 Preliminaries

Formulas of GL, denoted by A, B, C, are built up as follows:

$$A ::= P \mid \overline{P} \mid \top \mid \bot \mid (A \wedge A) \mid (A \vee A) \mid \Box A \mid \Diamond A \,,$$

where P and $\overline{P}$ stand for atoms and their complements.

The *negation* $\overline{A}$ of a formula A is defined in the usual way by De Morgan's laws, the law of double negation and the duality laws for modal operators, i.e. we inductively define

$$\begin{array}{rr} \overline{(P)} := \overline{P}, & \overline{\overline{P}} := P, \\ \overline{\top} := \bot, & \overline{\bot} := \top, \\ \overline{(A \wedge B)} := (\overline{A} \vee \overline{B}), & \overline{(A \vee B)} := (\overline{A} \wedge \overline{B}), \\ \overline{\Box A} := \Diamond \overline{A}, & \overline{\Diamond A} := \Box \overline{A}. \end{array}$$

We also put

$$A \to B := \overline{A} \vee B, \qquad A \leftrightarrow B := (A \to B) \wedge (B \to A).$$

The Hilbert-style axiomatization of GL is as follows:
Axioms:

(i) Boolean tautologies;

(ii) $\Box(A \to B) \to (\Box A \to \Box B)$;

(iii) $\Box(\Box A \to A) \to \Box A$.

Rules: modus ponens, $A/\Box A$.

Now we remind the reader a variant of the standard sequent-style formulation of GL. A *sequent* is a finite multiset of formulas denoted by Γ, Δ, Σ. Sequents are often written without any curly braces, and the comma in the expression Γ, Δ means the multiset union.

For a sequent $\Gamma = A_1, \ldots, A_n$, we put

$$\Diamond\Gamma := \Diamond A_1, \ldots, \Diamond A_n \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma^\sharp := \begin{cases} \bot & \text{if } n = 0, \\ A_1 \vee \ldots \vee A_n & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The system $\mathsf{GL}_{\mathsf{Seq}}$, which is a sequent-style formulation of GL, is defined by the following initial sequents and inference rules:

$$\Gamma, A, \overline{A} \qquad \Gamma, \top$$

$$\wedge\, \frac{\Gamma, A \qquad \Gamma, B}{\Gamma, A \wedge B} \qquad \vee\, \frac{\Gamma, A, B}{\Gamma, A \vee B}$$

$$\Box_{\mathsf{GL}}\, \frac{\Gamma, \Diamond\Gamma, \Diamond\overline{A}, A}{\Diamond\Gamma, \Box A, \Delta}\,.$$

The standard sequent calculus GLS for GL introduced by G. Sambin and S. Valentini ([8, 9]) was based on two-sided sequents $\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$ where Γ and Δ were sets. To facilitate proof-theoretic treatment of GL, we deal with one-sided sequents built from multisets, and consider formulas in negation normal form only.

A syntactic proof of the cut-elimination theorem for GLS was given by S. Valentini in [12]. For a multiset-based version of GLS, the analogous result was proved by R. Goré and R. Ramanayake in [4]. From the result of [4] and admissibility of structural rules for $\mathsf{GL}_{\mathsf{Seq}}$, we have the cut-elimination theorem for $\mathsf{GL}_{\mathsf{Seq}}$ immediately. Hence we have the following propositions:

Proposition 2.1. *The Löb rule and the cut rule*

$$\mathsf{Löb}\, \frac{\Gamma, \Diamond\Gamma, \Diamond\overline{A}, A}{\Gamma, \Diamond\Gamma, A} \qquad \mathsf{cut}\, \frac{\Gamma, A \qquad \Gamma, \overline{A}}{\Gamma}$$

are admissible for $\mathsf{GL}_{\mathsf{Seq}}$.

Proposition 2.2. $\mathsf{GL}_{\mathsf{Seq}} \vdash \Gamma \Longleftrightarrow \mathsf{GL} \vdash \Gamma^\sharp$.

3 Non-well-founded and Circular Proofs

A *derivation* in a sequent calculus is a finite tree whose nodes are marked by sequents that is constructed according to the rules of the sequent calculus. In the present section we also deal with proof systems that admit non-well-founded derivation trees, which we call ∞-*derivations*. A (∞-)*proof* is defined as a (∞-)derivation, where all leaves are labeled with initial sequents.

A tree is called *regular* if it contains only finitely many distinct subtrees. Equivalently, a regular tree is a tree that can be obtained by unraveling from a finite directed graph. A *regular* ∞-*derivation* is an ∞-derivation with regular derivation tree.

A *circular derivation* is a pair (κ, d), where κ is an ordinary derivation and d is a *back-link function* assigning to some leaf x an interior node y with an identical sequent such that y lies on the path from the root to the leaf. A *circular proof* is a circular derivation such that every leaf is either connected by the back-link function, or is marked by an initial sequent.

Recall that a sequent calculus for the standard modal logic $\mathsf{K4}$, denoted by $\mathsf{K4}_{\mathsf{Seq}}$, is obtained from $\mathsf{GL}_{\mathsf{Seq}}$ by replacing the rule $\Box_{\mathsf{GL}}$ by the modal rule:

$$\Box\,\frac{\Gamma, \Diamond\Gamma, A}{\Diamond\Gamma, \Box A, \Delta}\,.$$

We introduce the systems $\mathsf{GL}_{\mathsf{circ}}$ and GL_{∞} obtained from $\mathsf{K4}_{\mathsf{Seq}}$ by admitting circular proofs and arbitrary ∞-proofs, respectively. For example, consider a circular proof for Löb's axiom $\Box(\Box P \to P) \to \Box P$:

$$\Box\,\frac{\Box P \wedge \overline{P}, \Diamond(\Box P \wedge \overline{P}), P}{\wedge\,\dfrac{\Box P, \Diamond(\Box P \wedge \overline{P}), P \qquad \overline{P}, \Diamond(\Box P \wedge \overline{P}), P}{\Box\,\dfrac{\Box P \wedge \overline{P}, \Diamond(\Box P \wedge \overline{P}), P}{\vee\,\dfrac{\Diamond(\Box P \wedge \overline{P}), \Box P}{\Diamond(\Box P \wedge \overline{P}) \vee \Box P}}}}$$

Fig. 1

We stress that the notion of circular derivation is essentially coincide with the notion of regular ∞-derivation. Obviously, every circular derivation can be unraveled to the regular ∞-derivation. The converse also holds:

Proposition 3.1 (Chapter 6 in [2])**.** *Any regular* ∞*-derivation can be seen as the unraveling of a circular derivation.*

The rest of the section is devoted to proving the following result.

Theorem 3.2. $\mathsf{GL}_{\mathsf{Seq}} \vdash \Gamma \iff \mathsf{GL}_\infty \vdash \Gamma \iff \mathsf{GL}_{\mathsf{circ}} \vdash \Gamma$.

Lemma 3.3. $\mathsf{GL}_{\mathsf{Seq}} \vdash \Gamma \Longrightarrow \mathsf{GL}_\infty \vdash \Gamma$.

Proof. Assume π is a proof of Γ in $\mathsf{GL}_{\mathsf{Seq}}$. By corecursion, we define the ∞-proof $h(\pi)$ of Γ in GL_∞. The function h maps initial sequents into initial sequents and commutes with logical rules. The case of the modal rule is as follows:

$$\Box_{\mathsf{GL}} \dfrac{\begin{array}{c}\tau \\ \vdots \\ \Delta, \Diamond\Delta, \Diamond\overline{A}, A\end{array}}{\Diamond\Delta, \Box A, \Sigma} \quad \overset{h}{\longmapsto} \quad \Box \dfrac{\begin{array}{c}h(f(\tau)) \\ \vdots \\ \Delta, \Diamond\Delta, A\end{array}}{\Diamond\Delta, \Box A, \Sigma},$$

where $f(\tau)$ is a proof of $\Delta, \Diamond\Delta, A$ in $\mathsf{GL}_{\mathsf{Seq}}$ existed by admissibility of the Löb rule (Proposition 2.1). Then $h(\pi)$ proves Γ in GL_∞. □

We say that an inference rule is admissible for GL_∞ if, for every instance of the rule, the conclusion is provable whenever all premises are provable.

Lemma 3.4. *The inverses of logical rules of* GL_∞

$$\dfrac{\Gamma, A \wedge B}{\Gamma, A} \qquad \dfrac{\Gamma, A \wedge B}{\Gamma, B} \qquad \dfrac{\Gamma, A \vee B}{\Gamma, A, B} \qquad \dfrac{\Gamma, \bot}{\Gamma}$$

are admissible for GL_∞.

Proof. Simple transformations of proofs. □

Lemma 3.5. *The rules of weakening and contraction*

$$\mathsf{wk}\,\dfrac{\Gamma}{\Gamma, A} \qquad \mathsf{ctr}\,\dfrac{\Gamma, A, A}{\Gamma, A}$$

are admissible for GL_∞.

Proof. Admissibility of the weakening rule follows from the built-in weakening within initial sequents and the rule $\Box$.

We prove the admissibility of contraction by induction on the structure of A.

The cases of P, $\overline{P}$, $\top$, $\bot$, $\wedge$, $\vee$ and $\Box B$ are established standardly using the induction hypothesis, Lemma 3.4, and the definition of the rule $\Box$.

The case $A = \Diamond B$. Assume π is an ∞-proof of $\Gamma \cup \{\Diamond B, \Diamond B\}$ in GL_∞. By corecursion, we define the ∞-proof $h(\pi)$ of $\Gamma \cup \{\Diamond B\}$ in GL_∞. The function

h maps initial sequents into initial sequents and commutes with logical rules. Consider the case of the modal rule:

$$\Box\,\dfrac{\begin{array}{c}\tau\\ \vdots\\ \Delta, \Diamond\Delta, C\end{array}}{\Diamond\Delta, \Box C, \Sigma}\,.$$

If $\Diamond B \in \Sigma$, then h simply erases a copy of $\Diamond B$ from the conclusion of the proof. Otherwise, $\Delta = \Delta' \cup \{B, B\}$ and h maps this ∞-proof to the following:

$$\Box\,\dfrac{\begin{array}{c}\tau\\ \vdots\\ B, B, \Delta', \Diamond B, \Diamond B, \Diamond\Delta', C\end{array}}{\Diamond B, \Diamond B, \Diamond\Delta', \Box C, \Sigma} \quad \overset{h}{\longmapsto} \quad \Box\,\dfrac{\begin{array}{c}h(f(\tau))\\ \vdots\\ B, \Delta', \Diamond B, \Diamond\Delta', C\end{array}}{\Diamond B, \Diamond\Delta', \Box C, \Sigma}\,,$$

where $f(\tau)$ is an ∞-proof obtained from τ by contracting a copy of B from the conclusion of τ. This transformation is admissible by the inductive hypothesis. Then $h(\pi)$ proves $\Gamma \cup \{\Diamond B\}$ in GL_∞.

□

Lemma 3.6. $\mathsf{GL}_\infty \vdash \Gamma \Longrightarrow \mathsf{GL}_{\mathsf{circ}} \vdash \Gamma$.

Proof. For a sequent Δ, we denote its underlying set by Δ^S. We have $\Delta = \Delta^S, \Delta'$.

Let π be an ∞-proof of Γ in GL_∞. By corecursion, we define the ∞-proof $h(\pi)$ of Γ, which contains only finitely many different sequents. The function h maps initial sequents into initial sequents and commutes with logical rules. The case of the modal rule is as follows:

$$\Box\,\dfrac{\begin{array}{c}\tau\\ \vdots\\ \Delta, \Diamond\Delta, A\end{array}}{\Diamond\Delta, \Box A, \Sigma} \quad \overset{h}{\longmapsto} \quad \Box\,\dfrac{\begin{array}{c}h(f(\tau))\\ \vdots\\ \Delta^S, \Diamond\Delta^S, A\end{array}}{\Diamond\Delta^S, \Box A, \Sigma, \Diamond\Delta'}\,,$$

where $f(\tau)$ is an ∞-proof of $\Gamma^S, \Diamond\Gamma^S, A$ in GL_∞. This proof exists by the admissibility of the contraction rule.

Note that all formulas from $h(\pi)$ are subformulas of the formulas from Γ. Since there are only finitely many different premises of the rule $\Box$ in $h(\pi)$, and, for the other rules, conclusions are longer than premises, we have that $h(\pi)$ contains only finitely many different sequents. From any ∞-proof with finitely many different sequents, a regular ∞-proof can be obtained immediately. Hence, we have a circular proof of Γ by Proposition 3.1.

□

For a circular derivation $\pi = (\kappa, d)$, the set of assumption leafs of π is the set of non-axiomatic leafs of κ that are not connected by the back-link function d. We say that an assumption leaf is boxed if there is an application of the rule $\Box$ on the path from the root to the leaf. Let $BH(\pi)$ be the set of boxed assumption leafs of π, and $H(\pi)$ be the set of all other assumption leafs. For a subderivation τ of κ, we define the back-link function d_τ as the the set of all links from d with images inside τ.

Recall that $\boxdot A$ is an abbreviation for $A \wedge \Box A$.

Lemma 3.7. $\mathsf{GL}_{\mathsf{circ}} \vdash \Gamma \Longrightarrow \mathsf{GL}_{\mathsf{Seq}} \vdash \Gamma$.

Proof. Given a circular derivation $\pi = (\kappa, d)$ of Γ, we claim that

$$\mathsf{GL} \vdash \bigwedge\{\boxdot\Delta_a^\sharp \colon a \in H(\pi)\} \wedge \bigwedge\{\Box\Delta_a^\sharp \colon a \in BH(\pi)\} \to \Gamma^\sharp \,,$$

where Δ_a is the sequent of a. The proof is by induction on the structure of κ.

If κ consists of a single sequent, then our claim is obvious. Otherwise, consider the last application of an inference rule in κ. We have three cases:

$$\wedge\,\frac{\begin{array}{cc}\tau_1 & \tau_2\\ \vdots & \vdots\\ \Delta, A & \Delta, B\end{array}}{\Delta, A \wedge B} \qquad \vee\,\frac{\begin{array}{c}\tau\\ \vdots\\ \Delta, A, B\end{array}}{\Delta, A \vee B} \qquad \Box\,\frac{\begin{array}{c}\tau\\ \vdots\\ \Delta, \Diamond\Delta, A\end{array}}{\Diamond\Delta, \Box A, \Sigma}$$

Suppose the conclusion of κ is not connected by the back-link function. Recall that

$$\mathsf{GL} \vdash (\Delta, A)^\sharp \wedge (\Delta, B)^\sharp \to (\Delta, A \wedge B)^\sharp, \qquad \mathsf{GL} \vdash (\Delta, A, B)^\sharp \to (\Delta, A \vee B)^\sharp,$$
$$\mathsf{GL} \vdash \Box(\Delta, \Diamond\Delta, A)^\sharp \to (\Diamond\Delta, \Box A, \Sigma)^\sharp.$$

We see that the claim follows from the induction hypothesis for (τ, d_τ) (or for (τ_1, d_{τ_1}) and (τ_2, d_{τ_2})) immediately.

The only remaining case is that the conclusion of κ is connected by the back-link function. Recall that there is always an application of the rule $\Box$ on the path between two nodes connected by the back-link function. By the induction hypothesis and from the previous cases, we have:

$$\mathsf{GL} \vdash \bigwedge\{\boxdot\Delta_a^\sharp \colon a \in H(\pi)\} \wedge \bigwedge\{\Box\Delta_a^\sharp \colon a \in BH(\pi)\} \wedge \Box\Gamma^\sharp \to \Gamma^\sharp \,.$$

Since the Löb rule is admissible for GL, the assumption $\Box\Gamma^\sharp$ can be dropped out. Hence,

$$\mathsf{GL} \vdash \bigwedge\{\boxdot\Delta_a^\sharp \colon a \in H(\pi)\} \wedge \bigwedge\{\Box\Delta_a^\sharp \colon a \in BH(\pi)\} \to \Gamma^\sharp \,.$$

Now if π is a circular proof of Γ, then $\mathsf{GL} \vdash \Gamma^\sharp$. By Proposition 2.2, $\mathsf{GL}_{\mathsf{Seq}} \vdash \Gamma$. $\square$

4 Lyndon Interpolation Syntactically

Lyndon interpolation for Gödel-Löb logic was established in [10] on the basis of Kripke semantics. Here we present a proof-theoretic argument for the same result. In fact, we establish a simple strengthening of this property.

Atoms P and their complements $\overline{P}$ are called *literals*. By $u(A)$, denote the set of literals L occurring in A out of the scope of all modal operators. For atoms P and their complements $\overline{P}$, we also consider new symbols of the form P° and $\overline{P}^\circ$ and call them *marked literals*. By $v(A)$, denote the set of marked literals L° such that there is an occurrence of L in A within the scope of a modal operator. Put $w(A) = u(A) \cup v(A)$.

Theorem 4.1 (Lyndon interpolation)**.** *If* $\mathsf{GL} \vdash A \to B$*, then there is a formula* C*, called an interpolant of* $A \to B$*, such that* $w(C) \subset w(A) \cap w(B)$*, and*

$$\mathsf{GL} \vdash A \to C, \qquad \mathsf{GL} \vdash C \to B.$$

For a sequent Γ_1, Γ_2, the expression of the form $\Gamma_1 | \, \Gamma_2$ is called its *splitting*. An *interpolant of a split sequent* $\Gamma_1 \mid \Gamma_2$ is defined as an interpolant of the formula $\overline{(\Gamma_1^\sharp)} \to \Gamma_2^\sharp$. Thus, it is sufficient to find interpolants for all splittings of provable sequents.

The standard proof-theoretic strategy of constructing an interpolant is based on the following observations:

1. given an application of an inference rule of a cut-free sequent calculus, every splitting of the conclusion produces splittings of the premises preserving ancestor relationship;

2. there is an explicit definition of the interpolant for the split sequent in the conclusion from interpolants of the split sequents in the premises.

For the rules of $\mathsf{GL}_{\mathsf{circ}}$, these observations can be summed up in the following split inference system, where in the parentheses we present the process of constructing an interpolant:

$$(\top) \;\; \Gamma_1 \mid \top, \Gamma_2 \qquad (\bot) \;\; \Gamma_1, \top \mid \Gamma_2$$

$$(\bot) \;\; \Gamma_1, A, \overline{A} \mid \Gamma_2 \qquad (\overline{A}) \;\; \Gamma_1, A \mid \overline{A}, \Gamma_2 \qquad (\top) \;\; \Gamma_1 \mid A, \overline{A}, \Gamma_2$$

$$\wedge_l \frac{(C) \;\; \Gamma_1, A \mid \Gamma_2 \qquad (D) \;\; \Gamma_1, B \mid \Gamma_2}{(C \vee D) \;\; \Gamma_1, A \wedge B \mid \Gamma_2} \qquad \vee_l \frac{(C) \;\; \Gamma_1, A, B \mid \Gamma_2}{(C) \;\; \Gamma_1, A \vee B \mid \Gamma_2}$$

$$\wedge_r \frac{(C)\ \ \Gamma_1 \mid \Gamma_2, A \qquad (D)\ \ \Gamma_1 \mid \Gamma_2, B}{(C \wedge D)\ \ \Gamma_1 \mid \Gamma_2, A \wedge B} \qquad \vee_r \frac{(C)\ \ \Gamma_1 \mid \Gamma_2, A, B}{(C)\ \ \Gamma_1 \mid \Gamma_2, A \vee B}$$

$$\Box_l \frac{(C)\ \ \Gamma_1, \Diamond\Gamma_1, A \mid \Gamma_2, \Diamond\Gamma_2}{(\Diamond C)\ \ \Diamond\Gamma_1, \Box A, \Delta_1 \mid \Diamond\Gamma_2, \Delta_2} \quad \Box_r \frac{(C)\ \ \Gamma_1, \Diamond\Gamma_1 \mid \Gamma_2, \Diamond\Gamma_2, A}{(\Box C)\ \ \Diamond\Gamma_1, \Delta_1 \mid \Diamond\Gamma_2, \Box A, \Delta_2}$$

Fig. 2

Now the notion of a *split circular derivation* can be defined naturally with the proviso that nodes connected by the back-link function marked by identical split sequents.

Lemma 4.2. *If there is a circular proof of* Γ_1, Γ_2 *in* $\mathsf{GL}_{\mathsf{circ}}$*, then there is a split circular proof of* $\Gamma_1 \mid \Gamma_2$*.*

Proof. Assume π is a circular proof of Γ_1, Γ_2. By bottom-up splitting of sequents from π, we obtain a split ∞-proof of $\Gamma_1 \mid \Gamma_2$. Since there are only finitely many different sequents in π, there are only finitely many different split sequets in the split ∞-proof of $\Gamma_1 \mid \Gamma_2$. From any ∞-proof with finitely many different sequents, a regular ∞-proof can be obtained immediately. Hence, we have a split circular proof of $\Gamma_1 \mid \Gamma_2$ by Proposition 3.1.

□

Now we state a variant of the salient fixed-point theorem for GL. For a set S of literals L and marked literals L°, define $S^\circ = \{L^\circ \colon L \in S \text{ or } L^\circ \in S\}$. Put $w^*(A) = w(A) \cup w^\circ(A)$.

Theorem 4.3. *Let* A *be a formula in which* P *and* $\overline{P}$ *only occur within the scope of modal operators. Then there is a formula* F *such that* $w(F) \subset (w^*(A) \cup w^*(\overline{A})) \setminus \{P^\circ, \overline{P^\circ}\}$*, and*

$$\mathsf{GL} \vdash \boxdot(P \leftrightarrow A) \leftrightarrow \boxdot(P \leftrightarrow F)\,.$$

Moreover, if A *does not contain* $\overline{P}$*, then* $w(F) \subset w^*(A) \setminus \{P^\circ\}$*.*

Note that this variant of the theorem can be obtained by a syntactic procedure without applying any kind of interpolation (see [5, 11]).

For a sequent Γ, define $\overline{\Gamma}$ as the multiset of negations of formulas from Γ. Let $w(\Gamma)$ be the set $\bigcup\{w(A) \colon A \in \Gamma\}$.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. It is sufficient to find interpolants for all splittings of provable sequents. Assume we have a circular proof of Γ_1, Γ_2. Applying Lemma 4.2, we find a split circular proof of $\Gamma_1 \mid \Gamma_2$, and construct an interpolant for this split sequent as follows.

Consider any split circular derivation $\pi = (\kappa, d)$ of $\Gamma_1 \mid \Gamma_2$. For any non-axiomatic leaf a of κ, we fix two unknowns X_a and w_a. The unknown atom X_a stands for an interpolant of the split sequent in the leaf a. The intended interpretation of w_a is $w(X_a)$. Let the split sequent of the leaf a be $\Delta_1 \mid \Delta_2$. Define I_a as the formula $(\overline{(\Delta_1^\sharp)} \to X_a) \wedge (X_a \to \Delta_2^\sharp)$ and I'_a as the statement $w_a \subset (w(\overline{\Delta}_1) \cap w(\Delta_2))$. For a formula D, which can contain new atoms X_a, let $w_X(D)$ be $w(D) \setminus \{X_a, X_a^\circ \colon X_a \text{ occurs in } D\}$.

Now we claim that there is a formula C such that C does not contain literals of the form $\overline{X}_a$, atoms $\{X_a \colon a \in BH(\pi)\}$ can occur in C only within the scope of modal operators, and

$$\mathsf{GL} \vdash \bigwedge\{\boxdot I_a \colon a \in H(\pi)\} \wedge \bigwedge\{\Box I_a \colon a \in BH(\pi)\} \to ((\overline{(\Gamma_1^\sharp)} \to C) \wedge (C \to \Gamma_2^\sharp)),$$

$$\bigwedge\{I'_a \colon a \in H(\pi) \cup BH(\pi)\} \Longrightarrow w_X(C) \\ \cup \bigcup\{w_a \colon a \in H(\pi)\} \cup \bigcup\{w_a^\circ \colon a \in BH(\pi)\} \subset w(\overline{\Gamma}_1) \cap w(\Gamma_2)\,. \quad (1)$$

The proof is by induction on the structure of κ.

Suppose the derivation κ consists of a single sequent. If the single leaf has the form of an initial sequent:

$$(\top)\ \ \Gamma_1 \mid \top, \Gamma_2 \qquad (\bot)\ \ \Gamma_1, \top \mid \Gamma_2$$
$$(\bot)\ \ \Gamma_1, A, \overline{A} \mid \Gamma_2 \qquad (\overline{A})\ \ \Gamma_1, A \mid \overline{A}, \Gamma_2 \qquad (\top)\ \ \Gamma_1 \mid A, \overline{A}, \Gamma_2\ ,$$

then the formula in parentheses is C. If the single leaf a is non-axiomatic, then C is equal to X_a.

Otherwise, there exists the last application of an inference rule in κ. Consider the case that the conclusion of κ is not connected by the back-link function. For instance, the last application of an inference rule has the form:

$$\wedge_r \dfrac{\begin{array}{cc} \tau_1 & \tau_2 \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ \Gamma_1 \mid \Gamma_2, A & \Gamma_1 \mid \Gamma_2, B \end{array}}{\Gamma_1 \mid \Gamma_2, A \wedge B}\ .$$

By the induction hypothesis, there are formulas C_1 and C_2, which satisfy all the required conditions for (τ_1, d_{τ_1}) and (τ_2, d_{τ_2}), respectively. We simply put $C \equiv C_1 \wedge C_2$. The cases of other inference rules are completely analogous. The construction of C for other rules is presented in parentheses in Fig. 2.

The only remaining case is that the conclusion of κ is connected by the back-link function. By b denote the non-axiomatic leaf connected by the

back-link function with the root of κ. From the previous cases, there is a formula C_0 which satisfies the required conditions for the circular derivation π_0 obtained from π by erasing the link connecting b with the root of κ. Notice that $b \in BH(\pi_0)$. The formula C_0 does not contain literals of the form $\overline{X}_a$, and atoms $\{X_a \colon a \in BH(\pi)\} \cup \{X_b\}$ can occur in C_0 only within the scope of modal operators. In addition, we have the following:

$$\mathsf{GL} \vdash \bigwedge\{\boxdot I_a \colon a \in H(\pi)\} \wedge \bigwedge\{\Box I_a \colon a \in BH(\pi)\} \wedge \Box I_b \\ \to (((\overline{\Gamma_1^\sharp}) \to C_0) \wedge (C_0 \to \Gamma_2^\sharp)) \,,$$

$$\bigwedge\{I'_a \colon a \in H(\pi) \cup BH(\pi)\} \wedge I'_b \Longrightarrow w_X(C_0) \cup w_b^\circ \\ \cup \bigcup\{w_a \colon a \in H(\pi)\} \cup \bigcup\{w_a^\circ \colon a \in BH(\pi)\} \subset w(\overline{\Gamma}_1) \cap w(\Gamma_2) \,. \quad (2)$$

From Theorem 4.3, there is a formula F such that $w(F) \subset w^*(C_0) \setminus \{X_b^\circ\}$ and

$$\mathsf{GL} \vdash \boxdot(X_b \leftrightarrow C_0) \leftrightarrow \boxdot(X_b \leftrightarrow F) \,.$$

Let us substitute X_b in C_0 with F and denote the result by C.

We claim that C satisfies the required conditions for π. Obviously, C does not contain literals of the form $\overline{X}_a$, and atoms $\{X_a \colon a \in BH(\pi)\}$ occur in C only within the scope of modal operators.

Furthermore, notice that $\mathsf{GL} \vdash I_b(F) \leftrightarrow (((\overline{\Gamma_1^\sharp}) \to C) \wedge (C \to \Gamma_2^\sharp))$. Applying admissibility of the Löb rule to the formula

$$\mathsf{GL} \vdash \bigwedge\{\boxdot I_a \colon a \in H(\pi)\} \wedge \bigwedge\{\Box I_a \colon a \in BH(\pi)\} \wedge \Box I_b(F) \\ \to (((\overline{\Gamma_1^\sharp}) \to C) \wedge (C \to \Gamma_2^\sharp)) \,,$$

we see that the assumption $\Box I_b(F)$ can be dropped out.

It remains to check condition (1). Assume $\bigwedge\{I'_a \colon a \in H(\pi) \cup BH(\pi)\}$. We claim that $w_X(C) \subset w(\overline{\Gamma}_1) \cap w(\Gamma_2)$. From (2) we have

$$I'_b \Rightarrow w_X(C_0) \cup w_b^\circ \subset w(\overline{\Gamma}_1) \cap w(\Gamma_2) \,.$$

Substituting w_b in I'_b with $\emptyset$, we get $w_X(C_0) \subset w(\overline{\Gamma}_1) \cap w(\Gamma_2)$. Thus $I'_b(w_X(C_0))$ is a valid statement. The second substitution of w_b in I'_b with $w_X(C_0)$, yields that $w_X(C_0) \cup w_X^\circ(C_0) \subset w(\overline{\Gamma}_1) \cap w(\Gamma_2)$. Consequently,

$$w_X(C) \subset w_X(C_0) \cup w_X^\circ(F) \subset w_X(C_0) \cup w_X^\circ(C_0) \subset w(\overline{\Gamma}_1) \cap w(\Gamma_2) \,.$$

From (2) we also have

$$I'_b \Rightarrow \bigcup\{w_a \colon a \in H(\pi)\} \cup \bigcup\{w^\circ_a \colon a \in BH(\pi)\} \subset w(\overline{\Gamma}_1) \cap w(\Gamma_2)\,.$$

Substituting w_b in I'_b with $\emptyset$, we get

$$\bigcup\{w_a \colon a \in H(\pi)\} \cup \bigcup\{w^\circ_a \colon a \in BH(\pi)\} \subset w(\overline{\Gamma}_1) \cap w(\Gamma_2)\,.$$

Hence condition (1) is satisfied.

Finally, if $\pi = (\kappa, d)$ is a split circular proof of $\Gamma_1|\Gamma_2$, then the constructed formula C is indeed an interpolant for this split sequent. □

Acknowledgements. I thank Lev Beklemishev and Maria Filatova for their personal support and helpful advises during the work on the paper. Thanks, Lev! A warm thank you, Maria!

References

[1] L. Alberucci and A. Facchini, *On modal μ-calculus and Gödel-Löb logic*, Studia Logica **91** (2009), 145–169.

[2] J. Brotherston, *Sequent calculus proof systems for inductive definitions*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Edinburgh, 2006.

[3] J. Brotherston, N. Gorogiannis, and R. L. Petersen, *A generic cyclic theorem prover*, Programming Languages and Systems (R. Jhala and A. Igarashi, eds.), Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 7705, Springer, 2012, pp. 350–367.

[4] R. Goré and R. Ramanayake, *Valentini's cut-elimination for provability logic resolved*, The Review of Symbolic Logic **5** (2012), 212–238.

[5] P. Lindström, *Provability logic—a short introduction*, Theoria **62** (1996), 19–61.

[6] S. Negri, *Proof analysis in modal logic*, Journal of Philosophical Logic **34** (2005), 507–544.

[7] F. Poggiolesi, *A purely syntactic and cut-free sequent calculus for the modal logic of provability*, The Review of Symbolic Logic **2** (2009), no. 4, 593–611.

[8] G. Sambin and S. Valentini, *A modal sequent calculus for a fragment of arithmetic*, Studia Logica **39** (1980), 245–256.

[9] _____, *The modal logic of provability. The sequential approach*, Journal of Philosophical Logic **11** (1982), 311–342.

[10] D. Shamkanov, *Interpolation properties for provability logics GL and GLP*, Proceedings of the Steklov Institute of Mathematics **274** (2011), 303–316.

[11] C. Smoryński, *Modal logic and self-reference*, Handbook of Philosophical Logic (D. Gabbay and F. Guenthner, eds.), vol. 11, Springer, Netherlands, 2 ed., 2004, pp. 1–53.

[12] S. Valentini, *The modal logic of provability: cut-elimination*, Journal of Philosophical Logic **12** (1983), 471–476.

[13] J. van Benthem, *Modal frame correspondences and fixed-points*, Studia Logica **83** (2006), 133–155.

[14] A. Visser, *Löb's logic meets the μ-calculus*, Processes, Terms and Cycles: Steps on the Road to Infinity (A. Middeldorp, V. van Oostrom, F. van Raamsdonk, and R. de Vrijer, eds.), Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 3838, Springer, 2005, pp. 14–25.